CREATION

A lecture given on 7 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

Going to talk to you about Creative Processes.

Cycle of action is create, create-create-create, no create.

Now, you say, *„What happens? Where's it go?"*

Well, if there's no postulate in the creation for its continuance, if there's no time connected with it, it doesn't go anywhere. There is no place for it to go. Now, basically, the reason why is there was nothing there in the first place, except your consideration.

Therefore, if it does evolve that an individual creates over a long time, he actually has to continue the creation. He has to continue the creation. In other words, he has to create it, create it, create it, create it, create it. All the time he has his attention on it, regardless of how many vias, he's having to put it there, put it there, put it there, put it there. And what is that but a re-creation?

He can say by consideration -- if he has the former consideration that he can do this -- he can say, *„That mock-up will now stay there."* But remember, he had to have the former consideration *„When I say a mock-up is going to stay there, it continues to be created."*

Now, that's what survival amounts to in almost everybody's bank. It says when it lives it lives; when it goes on living it goes on living, and that's the postulate and that's it.

Well, create, then, is a common denominator of many things. Why does one have to create again? He has to create again because of the postulate time. And that is the fact that we have a different universe every given instant. So we have to create something in this new universe at any given instant in order to have anything there in this new universe.

In any given instant, then, we mean that we have a disappearance. Well, we don't have a disappearance. We have a nonexistence. People ask the question, where did the mock-up go? It didn't go anywhere. And that is what is so puzzling. See, it didn't go anywhere. What happened to yesterday's universe? Well, it didn't go anywhere. It is not waiting anywhere at all. It was put there to last for a certain period of time and this, then, didn't require it to go anywhere. It's only going to last as a consideration for a certain period of time. Therefore, it no longer lasts. It just isn't there. It doesn't go anywhere. To go somewhere infers that it's continuing to last elsewhere. And every case you'll ever process has a louse-up right on that point. Where did yesterday go? Well, it didn't have any place to go to. Yesterday quit.

„Where am I going to store all these mock-ups I made yesterday?" Well now, a fellow can start doing that. And therefore, every time he creates today he has to create yesterday too.

I spoke to you yesterday about the time track. In every given instant the time track has to be re-created all over again. Because yesterday didn't go anyplace, we have this interesting mechanism, then, of storing it. Storing yesterday via a time track. When you look at it again you have to create it.

Anything you are looking at was created in that instant. Got that? Anything you are looking at was created in that instant that you are looking at it. The illusion occurs this way: We create by vias so that we think we are looking at something that was, that became a now. But we have vias that mock this up.

Now, we speak a lot about the destruction of engrams. All that an engram is, is a re-creation of an extant situation by a certain pattern. But the pattern is just by a series of vias which exist in now. It's the most fantastic testimony to what a thetan knows and doesn't know that he knows, that he can create things he knows nothing about all over again and then find out things from them that amaze him.

So this thing called a time track is to a marked degree a trick. That which you perceive was made at the instant you perceived it, to this degree: One's perception is more limited than the creative sphere. And that's another little law that has to go down there. Perception is usually less than the created sphere and is never more. Got it? It's usually less than the created sphere.

In other words, because you can see Keokuk does not mean that you also didn't create Los Angeles and New York. Just because you're only looking at Keokuk doesn't mean that you left Los Angeles and New York out of your creative action. You created Los Angeles, New York and Keokuk and only looked at Keokuk. People think of that happy day when they were children and only thought that the home front yard, they say, was there; and there was nothing beyond that front yard at all. But you tell them where Germany is, and they say it's over that little range of hills. Why do they think it's so close? Well, that's because in failing to create it properly, they create it in the wrong place. It's quite interesting though, if you took them to Germany they would see Germany. See, that becomes fascinating. That's the bug. How come they can see Germany?

Therefore, a thetan tells you one thing while he's doing something else. This is obvious.

Now, what -- what do we find as a common denominator of processing, then? Creativeness. Creativeness. Creativeness has a scale which begins with lies. Lies are the lowest level of creativeness.

The next scale above lies is, of course, the creation of a thought. Just plain creation of a thought, independent of other thoughts.

The next level above that is the creation of a mechanic. But people run them in reverse: They have to be able to create the mechanical adequately before they can create a thought. That's just the way it stacks up.

The number of people who create thoughts are very few. H.L. Mencken, just before his death, wrote quite a dissertation on this. And his opinion of the ability of man to think an original thought was poor.

But for a man to create a thought, he evidently -- if he's fairly low down the line -- has to have the idea that he can create a mass or a space or something. So the creation of masses, spaces, particles, so on, is actually below the ability to create a thought.

You see, one gets starved for masses, spaces and particles and believes that these have in them a number of thoughts. They believe these things have in them a number of thoughts. And so they take the thoughts out of these masses. They remove the thoughts already extant in the masses of yesterday. Of course, they have to put them there to remove them, but that's perfectly all right. They believe that these thoughts came from the masses.

They develop philosophies. Man is fantastic. He develops a philosophy like dialectic materialism. He says every thought comes from the collision of two forces. (Two or more forces he should have said.) By the way, that's not even scientifically well written. You know? I mean, it has extraordinaries. Like why two forces? Why not three forces? You know? That kind of nonsense.

Of course, somebody with a scarcity of masses treasures the masses. And he says, *„These masses are really something.“* And he rather deifies them. And he says, *„When you bump these two masses together, of course, you get a thought out of them; that shows you that they're God.“*

And the only difference between Roman Catholicism and nuclear physics is that the Roman Catholic has an easier idea getting some thoughts into space. In nuclear physics we get thoughts into space by banging together masses. But there's no less deity involved. There is no less a worshipful attitude toward these masses that give up these beautiful reactions.

Every once in a while they turn around and tell you, if they're not watching themselves too carefully or if they've had a drink, *„Isn't God wonderful!“* You know, they turn the reactor on and let it react for a while, and they turn around to you, *„Isn't God wonderful!“* Now, they got tired of having God in space and put him back in idol form. That's the truth of the matter.

Any race does this eventually. It gets tired of looking into space and ruining all of its havingness and puts their gods into masses. Actually, probably idolatry is much more healthy from a standpoint of body masses than a spatial religion. You got something real solid, you can walk up to it and lean on it, you know, and you can say, *„Oh boy. Yeah, I know God heard me now; there he is.“* See?

Savage people worship rocks, and so forth. And that's pretty low- toned and pretty barbaric when they get down to worshipping rocks. But when you get down to wor- shipping rocks you can't see, you've got the modern atomic physicist.

So anyway, these boys actually are copartners in the creation of any given instant. And the instants which were, just aren't. It's too simple though, of course, you see? It's -- have to make it more complicated. But the instants which were, aren't: They didn't go anywhere.

Now, if you understand this clearly, then you understand what is wrong with your preclear is his ability to create. Ability to create thoughts, his ability to create particles and masses in terms of the bank and certainly, observably, he is very deficient in being able to create walls that are as big as and solid as the room walls.

I told a preclear one time -- just making an experiment -- something that would appall you, I'm sure. You speak of the Auditor's Code, a break this bad, you see, malice aforethought, can happen in the world of research but you actually have to add about four or five more clauses onto it before the break can be conceived to be big enough. You see?

He was making mock-ups, and he was doing rather well. I was testing the action of mocking up barriers. And he kept saying he was mocking up barriers, and he kept say- ing he was mocking up barriers. And I finally said to him, *„You're sure you're mocking up barriers now?“* I said, *„Where are you mocking them up?“* And he pointed to a line out in the middle of the floor and so forth. And I walked over and patted the line and felt around it and passed my hand through it and so on. Pulled Steves's trick that he pulled back there in '53. Kept telling preclears to mock up a Coke bottle, and then say, *„I can't see it.“* You know? This was to encourage them to make more solid mock-ups. And I told this preclear I couldn't feel that wall. I couldn't feel it. I didn't think he was doing well. Asked him if he was sick or something. And got him to struggling to make the walls thicker and heavier and thicker and heavier. And I finally said, *„You know, I don't think we better go on with the session. Maybe you need some rest. Maybe you should go take a rest and we might try this again tomorrow.“*

He says, *„Why? What's the matter with you?“*

I said, *„I can't feel these walls. I don't think they're there.“*

He went into an awful decline. Isn't that odd? I was trying to find out why he went into a decline. He intended to pick an agreement and he picked a disagreement.

So he came in the next morning intending to pick a disagreement. We had a wonder- ful fight, and he felt much better. And we got on, and his mock-ups got right back to where they ought to have been. You see? I was trying to damage his mock-ups so that

I could improve them again, and succeeded in doing so. I had him with mock-ups there that were fabulous, for him. He never saw such mockups. But he kept making them, by the way, on the basis: *„Of course, you wouldn't think this is very much, but...“* Now, what is this whole mechanism of creation in terms of masses and spaces? It is conviction of existence. Conviction of existence. There are a number of postulates which go into this action of putting up a mock-up. But the basic postulate, of course, is *„There it is!“* The next one is, is *„I perceive it.“*

Now, if you go around having a preclear saying, *„I perceive it, I perceive it, I perceive it, I perceive it,“* why do the walls get stronger to him and heavier? Now, that is, then, a reverse perception. He was on an inversion. See, he'd said *„I perceive it, I perceive it, I perceive it“* so hard and so furiously, so factually, he tried to be so convincing about having perceived it, that he started to drop out of the bottom on this whole basis of having perceived it. And the harder he says *„I perceive it“* now, the less he perceives it. Why?

The mechanism didn't work. He has lost on this mechanism too many times. He said, *„I perceive it,“* and then nobody else agreed with him. He said, *„I perceive it,“* and then something happened to it. Somebody else had a mock-up in front of it. Somebody was playing a joke on him or something of the sort. You see? Mix-ups of perception. But the perception was basically *„I perceive it.“* However, your preclear doesn't go into all of these delicacies. He simply wants to put something up and see it. And this he does, and he needn't make an articulated postulate in order to do it.

A thetan doesn't go around thinking *„Now I will think a thought: Mm. I have thought a thought.“* No. He says -- he doesn't have to think *„Now I am going to put up a mass,“* and then put up a mass. He just -- Mass. See? That's all there is to it. He doesn't really think *„Now I am going to move my body's arm,“* and then put a postulate into the body's arm which then moves the body's arm, see? It's perfectly easy to make the postulate the action. See, not to confuse two things; I mean, that's the postulate, see? You could do that just as easily as the other way.

You can get a guy so that he doesn't know whether he's walking on his head or his hands by simply asking him, *„Just what do you tell your legs to get them to move?“* Of course, this is a lie! He doesn't ever tell his legs anything to get them to move. He simply says *„Action,“* and he has an action.

Now, because he has to tell other people something before they do anything, he gets this confused with himself. And he believes he should tell himself something before he does something. And this is not at all true.

So therefore, any instantaneous reaction in front of his face in the engram bank is liable to surprise him. He doesn't consider himself capable of it. He doesn't say, *„Now I am going to get an action,“* and get an action in front of his face. Instead of that -- that isn't what happened -- he simply has an action in front of his face which can exert considerable influence against the body, and this surprises him. He doesn't know that he's capable of this.

Well, I don't know why he keeps this hidden from himself, except that it makes more game. But the funny part of it is, is an engram appears in front of somebody's face on the same basis that he moves his arm without telling it to do so. You might say it's a mass postulate. Quite amazing.

Now, you can actually get somebody making these mass postulates, and he can get into much better shape. You can ask him such a question as *„How much effort could you exert in moving that desk?"* You just run this as a process. *„How much effort could you exert in moving that chair?" „How much effort could you exert...?"* Not how much less effort, you know, but just how much effort, which makes him really go in the direction of more effort. *„How much effort could you employ, now, in holding yourself to the floor?"*

Now, he'll think he's running out things. He isn't running anything out. He is exercising his ability just like the strongman exercises his ability to appear interesting in front of this huge audience. A strongman takes a five-hundred-pound dumbbell and -- although he, after the show, picks it up and just tosses it lightly on the truck -- in front of the audience, he picks up that five-hundred-pound barbell with the grunts and groans that would give a giant a hernia. Man! And sweat runs off of him, and he trembles, and he poises himself just so. And finally gets it up to a half-lift and then finally shoots it to a whole-lift. And boy, this is really dramatic! It's easy for him to do it. Now he's trying to make it harder to do so that he'll get more appreciation.

There isn't anything in the universe that is hard to do. But nothing that is easy to do gets applause. So the communication formula enters into the basis of *„if you want attention you'd better make it difficult,"* and that is where we get our basic complexity. That's why things must be more complicated. The strongman effort.

For instance, I upset a pediatrician, just yesterday. I told him, *„You handle children extremely well."* A wave of pain went across his face. I'd come close to tapping this one: It is fantastically easy for him to handle children. Everybody considers that this is very difficult. And in two or three years in his career, he will have made it more difficult. But I tell him that he does it well, you see? I have already crossed him up a little bit. Just malice aforethought. Just my pointing my fangs at the medical profession slightly.

Of course, I probably should have gone one better. I think now I should have asked him, *„How do you go about handling children that well? Just what do you do that..."*

I told him this because he made a strange remark to me. He asked me if I ever read the book called Peter the Fisherman, or something of that sort. The little children, he'd pick them up and they'd stop crying. That was how he explained his ability. I think this chap will be needing our assistance one of these days, because he's got himself all mocked up into the saint bracket. He must be eight yards, invertedly, back of his own head. You know?

If a thetan can't stop a child from crying he ought to quit. It is very easy. But if you think it's difficult, and you get a big regimen for doing it and so forth, you'll find it's hard to stop children from crying -- quite difficult to stop children from crying. As a matter of fact, the more you insist that they stop crying, the more they cry. Isn't that peculiar? Hm? You say, *„Now, you haven't got anything to cry about; what are you crying for?"*

It's an interesting thing that if a child has skinned his knee, for instance, and you tell him, *„That is nothing. That is nothing. What are you crying about? You shouldn't pay any attention to that,"* and so forth, you can actually observe the bruise develop much more rapidly. Because he actually is holding a bruise up to you. See? Well, something is putting the bruise there. The body, without assistance, wouldn't hold the bruise. It has to have the assistance of a mental image picture bank in order to hold that bruise.

So we get this whole thing of making it more difficult. If you want to get attention you make it harder. Got the idea?

Now, if you've got somebody who has this kick, all you have to do is ask him to make it more difficult. Now, you can process an incident this way: You can say, *„Tell me something worse. Tell me something worse than that. Come on, give me something worse than that. Give me something worse than that. Something worse than that. Something worse than that. Something worse than that."* And it's an interesting thing that the incident will process under these lines: You just make it worse, make it worse, make it worse.

Actually the alternate question -- *„Invent an individuality that could cope with it,"* and *„Tell me or invent a worse situation"* -- is a killer. That blows engrams. That's a real fine process. One and two. One and two. One and two. *„Invent an individuality that could cope with it."* *„Invent a worse situation."* *„Invent an individuality that could cope with it"* -- just some specific incident.

All right. Now we have this, then, workable in other factors, and one of those factors is effort. And most everybody around has difficulty with effort. They have difficulty because of estimation of; they don't measure the resistances of other things. See, they don't measure this. They get one-sided about every effort problem. They don't measure the resistance of the door; they measure their resistance in opening the door. You got that?

Now, what is wrong with their ability to experience is the ability to experience effort is poorly developed. You got it? If you cannot measure the effort of the door at the same time you're measuring your effort in opening the door, you won't open the door smoothly. Now, this is the answer to that peculiar riddle: Some people do things very clumsily and some people do things very smoothly. Some people go down and run a piece of machinery on and on and on, and nothing bad occurs. Somebody else starts running this same piece of machinery and everything bad occurs. Well, that is because the individual running the machinery is measuring one of two things, or both.

Now, somebody could actually only measure the machine's effort. Or somebody could only measure his own effort. It requires somebody to measure both efforts. He has to be sensible of both efforts in order to do a good job of handling. Follow me?

In order to speak, it is not enough to control the body and the voice tones in front of an audience. Oddly enough, you also have to have in some small grip the audience's ability to listen. See that? There's two sides of this.

Now, pan-determinism is the term we assign to handling both sides of a situation, two or more sides. And self-determinism is the definition we assign to handling one side.

Now, it's awfully good for a person to handle just one side. That's awfully good. That's wonderful if he can handle one side. Few people can do that. He can handle one side of it perfectly, so we say he's a self-determined individual, and this is a compliment.

But the funny part of it is, if he were really good, he'd handle both sides: He'd be pandetermined. He would have the rock's effort to stay against the ground and his own effort to lift the rock so measured and calculated that his effort to lift the rock would be minimal. Unless he was trying to make it difficult.

Well, the way you make it difficult is to make that rock decide all by itself how much it should stick against the ground. And in that there's nothing there to decide, we of course get a heavy rock. See this?

All right. Now, we look this over and we find out, then, that a preclear is making his case more difficult. He does not go easily in the direction of simplicity of case. He makes his case more difficult. His case got him attention; in order to get more attention, he's got to have more case. Got the idea? Case got him attention. More difficulty: more attention. See?

Also we have this other factor coming in alongside of it. We have more communication. There are more things to communicate with. He has a greater complexity of communication. He knows better than to break off communications; this is always painful. This he knows. So we ask people questions like, *„How much effort could you use in lifting that chair?" „How much effort could you use in lifting that rock?" „How much effort could you employ?" „How much worse could you make that situation?"*

That is sort of an insulting sort of question, but I've had it work many times during an emergency. Somebody is running around in a small circle, and I've stopped them and asked them, *„Now, let's see, how much worse could you make this situation?"* They take a double-take, and then they kind of laugh and actually do something effective. See, it snaps out the exactness of their action.

People are too prone to think of thought as without force. You can think a thought called a lightning bolt if you really know that lightning bolts are really simply a thought thought. See, lightning bolts are just a thought thought. Think a thought, crash! See? People articulate their thoughts. People think a thought and tell something else to think this thought and so on. Get the idea?

People postulate. That's just a little bit different than an action thought. They say it will happen; it is going to happen, so on.

There is the thing of just happenstance. You know, it happens. You mustn't overlook this because you'll run into it in auditing.

More game -- more difficulty. As a test I have sat and asked a preclear for five solid hours, *„How much worse could your case get?" „What could happen to you?"* I've asked him. I didn't ask him that as a repetitive auditing question; his case couldn't have stood it. See, I asked him that question but I asked it in so -- enough ways to get into communication with him. *„Well, you say your health has been pretty bad. How much worse do you think*

it could get? Mm-hm, hm-mm. Could it get any worse than that? Uh-huh, well, you say your lungs. Well, could they get any worse than that? What's the worst you know about concerning lungs? How bad off can lungs actually get?" Of course, he runs down to the very unsatisfactory zero of dust. You know, dead, dust, so on. That's a nothingness. He doesn't like that. So the lungs, of course, he concludes, must survive in a badly decayed condition for a very long time. See, because they really don't get worse when they die. Body goes and makes some better lungs; he knows that. Follow this as an action?

Now, creation, then, gets branded with a number of significances. These significances are what the individual thinks are good and what he thinks are bad. And these are regulated by *„How much attention can I get? How much attention can be delivered?"* or *„How much communication would I have to get up if I got rid of something?"* Even an engram is something to communicate with in the lonely little shell of a head that the thetan has, you know? Even an engram is something to communicate with.

Now, you essentially, as an auditor, use these principles continuously. You use these principles all the time. You say, *„What more could I communicate with around here, for this preclear?"* You say, *„All right, now we'll have him communicate with the wall. We'll have him communicate with the floor, the ceiling."* Why? That's to give him enough communication.

Now, if you give him enough communication, after a while you can call it to his attention that you are breaking communication. Now, you can call that to his attention roughly or smoothly. You can say, *„Break communication. Break communication, break communication, break communication."* And he'll collapse. I don't know, nobody has ever taken it past the point of death, so we don't know whether a thetan has ever gotten well from this process or not. Might be a wonderful process, but nobody has ever survived it. We get them down toward feeling woggy and out of communication, and they stop running the process. And we really don't have any way to keep them running the process. So we assume that breaking communication or breaking ARC or stopping ARC is at once a fatal activity for an auditor to engage upon.

Now, this goes further than that. It is a very arduous thing to run processes which are broken-communication processes. It's hard to do this. In addition to that, they are not very therapeutic, which tends then to kind of rule them out. Doesn't it?

But there is one break-communication process which stands in an isolated state; Not-Know Processes. Now, those are broken-communication processes and theoretically should make a guy worse. But because it's an automaticity that's being overcome, the worseness of it is improved by the gain from taking something off automatic. The earliest version of this is *„Something you wouldn't mind forgetting."* A later version is *„Look around the room and find something you would not mind forgetting,"* since not-know doesn't communicate well. You tell them, *„Look around the room and find something you would not mind forgetting."*

Now that, of course, is essentially a break-communication process, isn't it? Evidently the automaticity that is overcome permits the person to gain more. His havingness actually increases on the process, not decreases. So he's really getting more communication all the time. It's quite amazing. In other words, there's a trick involved with that

process which makes it the peculiar way you can get him to break communication. But don't try to get him to break communication in other ways; it doesn't work.

I'll tell you a signal failure: You ask an individual, *„Break communication with the ceiling.“* He finds that not too hard to do because he hasn't got hold of the ceiling. *„Break communication with the wall behind you.“*

He says, *„That's all right. I can do that. I'm not looking at it anyway.“*

„Break communication with the side wall. Break communication with the other side wall. That's fine. Break communication with the front wall.“ He's still able to do these things, you see?

And you say, *„All right, now break communication with the floor.“* You say, *„Go ahead, break communication with the floor. What's the matter?“*

He says, *„What's the matter?“* he says. *„I've broken communication with the floor.“*

„I don't know. You still got your feet on the floor.“

„Oh, you want me to break my body's communication with all these things. Well, I can't.“

„Well, let's start it all over again now. Let's break communication with the ceiling. Let's break communication with the back wall. Break communication with the right-side wall. Break communication with the left-side wall. Break communication with the front wall. Now break communication with the floor.“

„What are you trying to do to me?“ Down the scale he goes.

Give him a subjective process. *„How many people could you go out of communication with?“* *„Is there anybody around that you wouldn't mind not talking to?“* Any of these processes. These are all killers!

Now, they appear to be good processes, and therefore you could sit there obviously obeying the Auditor's Code and kill your preclear. I won't say that there aren't some preclears that deserve it. But I will say that it's not therapeutic. It just isn't. Why? Since obviously the world and the universe is breaking off the fellow's communication every instant.

There goes the time track, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa- pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, lost communication, lost communication, lost havingness, lost havingness, lost havingness, lost havingness. He'll eventually try anything he can do to stop this continuous loss. He never asks himself this question: Is it lost? Is it lost? Did it go into wasn't? Has it disappeared into any ain't? Or have you still got it? We're obviously merely dealing with a trick. The individual, then, isn't breaking communication with every given instant on the track.

He could look the other way and find out that the time of the future as it becomes the time of the present gives him something new to communicate with in any given instant.

You can actually turn his attention on this. You can say, *„Shut your eyes. When you open them up find a brand-new world. Open them up. All right. Shut your eyes and when you open them up find a brand-new world. Open them up. All right. Shut your eyes...”*

And all of a sudden he says, „*What's going on here? You mean I'm getting a new universe every second? Of course, I can't count on it! Whoever that is, Skirt the drummer, may stop drumming at any moment.*" One of the more civilized theories of what keeps the universe running. It's somebody's dream, and the person will lie there and dream as long as his drummer keeps drumming; but someday the drummer is liable to get tired. And then the dreamer will wake up, and Earth is gone, and the world is gone, and the universe is gone. That's much more practical than most scientific theories on the subject. Now, merely because it's romantic is no reason to denounce its practicality.

All right. Well, the common denominator of all this is conviction. Funny part of it is, it doesn't process worth a nickel. Must be something wrong here if it doesn't process any better than it does. Must be, then, that a thetan really can put a universe there and perceive it. Just look over that statement. He really can put a universe there and perceive it. It must be a fact that this can happen. It may be that this is not simply a delusion. It may be that he actually can put a universe there. Got the idea now?

Now, what is this? This is just the grading of a consideration. This minute grading of a consideration. People who cannot create or do Creative Processes are people who are convinced that there isn't anything there even if they create it. People who can't create are people who are convinced that there isn't anything there even if they did create it.

Now, let's just accept as factual that a thetan can create something and perceive it. Let's just accept that as a fact. You got it? That he has to continue to create or he doesn't continue to perceive.

An easy example of this: If an office boy fails to create his job newly in any given hour of the day, he soon finds himself without a job. He thinks he is holding a job. Nobody ever holds a job; one creates a job; one has to continue to create a job.

And this one, fully explained to a PE class over a course of a couple of hours, will cause some of the doggonedest reformations of attitude toward work you ever cared to measure. You don't hold a job; you don't get a job and then hold it. You have to create a job and keep it created.

Now, the ability to create goes over into an unknowing creation. And this unknowing creation could be solid or it could be not solid. But this is beyond this realm of discussion. It may be true that a thetan can create a universe. After all, you perceive one, don't you? Well, it may be true that it can be created. It may be true that it is not a delusion. It is maybe true that it is not a chimerical universe. But it's certainly difficult to create a universe that you can't see. Ah, that's difficult.

He scares himself half to death whenever he does this: He creates particles like gamma rays that he cannot see, which yet have a terrific effect upon his universe. Boy, what a game that is! What a wonderful game that is! Creates these things and he can't see them, and he doesn't know when they're present except by reading the action of a needle. Well, the needle can perceive them, a body can perceive them, why can't a thetan perceive them? That's just because he says he can't. Everything else can perceive them but he can't. That's one of the silliest things you ever ran into in your life. He's just decided that he can't perceive them.

So you see where we're going here? We're not talking about gamma rays; we're talking about mock-ups. Now, the rays are there. Needles can see them, meters can see them, bodies can see them, health charts can see them, but a thetan can't.

Well, it must be that he can't simply because he's decided that he can't. And that is the single decision which stands between being able to get a mock-up and not being able to get a mock-up. That's the single decision. You can get a lot of contributory decisions, but it's certainly a clear-cut decision when you finally hit it. He has decided that he can't see mock-ups.

When did he decide this? Well, you don't care. There are two ways to wear it out. Simply make him mock something up until he can mock it up. That very often works, but it's not a panacea or you would hear more about it as a process. You could have him look around and find things that weren't making mock-ups. This is effective. Effective. It does something. But if you look around and have him find things that can't see them, you're liable to solve that, right now.

See, there are several things that would work. There are several triggers on the line that should work. But the test is, the one that does work. The one that does work. Having a person spot things which can't see mock-ups will run out an awful lot of auditing. See why it would?

Now, if you ask Joe to put up a mock-up and he put up a mock-up and then you convinced him it wasn't there, like I convinced that preclear under a test (that guy wasn't a -- he was a test case; he wasn't a preclear) *„Put up a wall. Put up a wall. It's not there. I can't feel it. What's the matter with you? Are you sick? Why don't you go home and get some rest?“* I keyed that boy in across the boards. Ruined him; invalidated him; upset him, so forth. How come he got mock-ups the next day? (I didn't tell you.) Well, he got mock-ups the next day because I had him spot things that couldn't see mock-ups. Got it?

Now, an individual who can no longer see mock-ups does this interesting thing: He mocks them up and otherwise perceives them, otherwise experiences them, but doesn't any longer see them or forthrightly, in a high knowing category, perceive them. And he feels haunted. He feels pretty upset.

Now, an individual who can't make one is something else entirely different. This category we have to enter into and inspect, one way or the other. This individual is having trouble with effort. We always call him the trouble-with-effort case. And the funny part of it is we really can't get him to postulate it. There is nothing wrong with his ability to make them except that he won't. So therefore, we cannot consider him a clear-cut case. *„The reason Joe does not have mock-ups is because he can't see them.“* That's not exactly the proper statement.

There could be two things wrong. It may be that he won't put them up. And this would be something on the order of a fellow who wouldn't lift his arm.

You say to this fellow, *„Can you lift the arm?“*

And he says, *„Well, maybe.“*

And you say, *„Well, go ahead and lift it."* And he lifts it. And you say, *„Did you lift your arm?"*

And he says, *„Yes."*

All right. You say to this fellow, *„Can you make mock-ups?"*

And he says, *„Ah-mm, no."*

„Well, have you ever tried?"

„Yeah, I tell the space out in front of me to have a mock-up, but nothing happens."

You say, *„Well, put one there. Put one there. Now see it."*

„Yeah, but how do you put one there?"

„Just put one there."

„Well, where am I going to get it?"

„Just put one there, will you?" And this is what is difficult about the process: getting him to put one there rather than say, *„One will now appear."* You get the difference?

Now, one of the ways you do that is to get him to lift his arm, and say, *„Did you tell your arm to move?"*

„No, you did."

„Oh well, I suggested to you that you should move your arm; then did you move your arm?"

„Yes, I then moved my arm."

„Well now, then did you tell your arm to move?"

„No."

„Well now, move your arm again. Good. Now, tell it to move."

So he says, *„All right, arm, move. Move. Move, damn you!"* Arm doesn't do a thing.

You say, *„All right, now you move your arm."* And he does.

You say, *„Now, just how are you putting these mock-ups there?"*

„Well, I'm telling them to appear, of course."

„All right. We'll go over this again."

By the way, I've spent an hour and forty minutes with a preclear just telling him to do these things before he finally caught the re -- got the correlation between these two points. I don't expect people to be that stupid. But this guy finally got it. He finally got it. And he was real proud of himself and he finally put a mock-up there. He said it was very exhausting at first because he didn't know where the energy was going to come from. So I told him to put the energy there too. I was in for another hour of it.

Now, you can get a guy, actually, to clench his teeth -- something he gets rather easily, particularly men; he will say it was somebody else's fist -- but you can get him to clench his teeth and grip his hands together real well and strain at it real hard and

make a fist appear in front of his face. Actually put a fist in front of his face. Got it? Actually do that. Men do that rather easily. Girls, it takes an open hand usually. Now, the funny part of it is, if you exercise on this very long, you can have a preclear practically breaking his own jaw with a nonexistent arm and a nonexistent fist that he put there.

There is a type of postulate which results directly in mechanics. And it isn't really a postulate at all; it's simply the mechanic. It is the fact! And if you work hard with a preclear, you get the preclear eventually to simply have the fact appear. Don't you see? The arm moves!

Now, sure enough, there may be consequences. But he's putting consequences there for the motion of his arm: His arm moves and it gets tired. *„Well now, put your arm there moving without tiredness; don't put tiredness there, just put your arm moving.“*

He goes, *„It's pretty hard to keep the tiredness from going there.“*

You say, *„No, no, just don't put it there; don't put it there. Let's try that again. All right. Now, you make your arm -- put motion there, put your arm moving, without putting any tiredness there.“* You say, *„Now is your arm tired?“*

„No, you told me not to put any there.“

You say, *„That's fine.“*

Now, a fellow is told that when he puts forward the mechanic of working and the use of energy he must also put forward tiredness with it. That makes it more difficult, don't you see? That gives him more game; that's more complexity. But when you tell him directly to do this without putting tiredness there and then work with him until he can, he can work just directly, just like that, with no further nonsense connected with it. It's rather fabulous.

Now, this is what you might call direct creation. You don't say, *„Space will now appear,“* and then look around, as you sometimes see a preclear do, to see if space appeared. Look, he couldn't possibly -- he couldn't possibly get away from knowing it appeared if he put it there. Could he? And yet he will look around for the mock-up. So you tell him to go ahead and see it. Well, this one he finds very difficult to manage sometimes.

Now, you can approach this on a covert or indirect way, such as, *„Spot things that can't see mock-ups.“* See? That's a very covert way. Got it? *„Spot things that aren't putting up mock-ups.“* See, that's pretty good.

Have him do something he already can do -- moving his arm, or something like this -- have him do it for a while and find out what else he's doing there, and just tell him to skip putting that up and just put up the motion of the arm. See? It's quite fabulous. Quite fabulous. Terribly direct approach, almost insultingly direct. You see? Awfully direct.

Now, if you get a guy straining at it, he can really put a desk here. Not on the basis that he is already putting a desk here so you're making him take over the automaticity of putting a desk here. That's too roundabout. When you simply make him put a desk

here, he'll be able to experience the existence of the desk here. And his perception goes right up like a rocket. Got it? It's much too direct a process.

That's why I am teaching you learning processes. You catch? Hm? That's why I'm teaching you learning processes. Because here are some processes that are so fantastically direct that all you do is cancel the preclear's effort to make them complex. You don't even pay any attention to it. You don't say we have to run a gradient scale on this. The only gradient scale you have to run on it is the gradient scale of persuasion.

It's just *„You do it. Now knock off whatever else you're doing; let's put that there.“*

And he says, *„Well, my energies are being all exhausted...“* And some other line of reason, reason, reason, reason why, reason why, reason... Well, skip it. Tell him to put it there and tell him to perceive it now. Put it there and perceive it. He'll scare himself half to death some of these times, by the way.

Now, I gave you another set of postulate processes which reaches this more covertly. They're very excellent, and I don't know anybody they don't work on: *„All right, decide to put a mock-up out there. Decide that if you did so it'd ruin the game and don't.“* And after a while, when he decides to put a mock-up out there, he simply starts putting one out there.

Now, that we know for sure works. But once you've put this one there and you accomplish that one, you have the next one: *„Decide to put a mock-up there that everybody can see. Now decide that would ruin the game and don't.“* See, those processes.

Now actually, that merges eventually with this other thing of *„Put a mockup there,“* but it doesn't do so smoothly. It isn't inevitable that these two processes go together and one produces the other, and you depend on the automaticity of those two processes following in sequence.

If you do that one for a while -- *„Decide to put a mock-up there. Then decide that would ruin the game and don't. Decide to put a mock-up there -- a big, brilliant mock-up up there, as big as that wall. Now decide that would ruin the game and don't“* -- you'll get him onto the inversion. See, his effort not to put one there causes one to occur. All sorts of oddities occur because of this. You fool around with these and you see these inversions work out, and so on.

But you have this other one, and this other one follows, to a marked degree, in its wake. Now, if you want somebody to mock up a man in the middle of the room that everybody can see, he simply puts a man there that everybody can see. See, it isn't just a matter of he says, *„A man will appear and everybody can see it,“* because he doesn't do this, see? He puts a man there. You get the idea, see? And he puts it there in a way that it stops light and therefore becomes perceivable. Got it? And boy, that really takes learning processes.

He has to finally listen to you. You have to really be able to audit. You have to get a communication through. And you should yourself have some very good concept of what you're doing there. You get that, of course, by moving the arm and doing other things, and saying, *„Now, wait a minute. Now, I move the arm. Now I feel some motion inside.*

Isn't that peculiar that I feel motion in this arm when I don't feel any motion in that chair out in front of me. I don't even feel its sitting-stillness. I feel this body's sitting- stillness. Well, why don't I feel that chair's sitting-stillness?"

„I don't know, why don't you? What's wrong with you? You been sick?"

Now, people stop doing this every now and then because they think they find it uncomfortable. They see a clammy wall or a clammy milk bottle or something.

First time I ever did this with any violence, had a wax-covered milk bottle out in Phoenix -- you know, one of these paper bottles -- and it was sitting on the table. And somebody was giving me some coffee-shop auditing. And I put this milk bottle -- I wasn't putting the milk bottle there; I was just simply seeing if I could communicate with anything else in the room, one way or the other. And all of a sudden, I communicated fully with this milk bottle. The Phoenix climate there promotes a certain clamminess on something that's very, very cold and is suddenly brought out into the room air. It was the clammiest, horriblest feeling thing I ever ran into directly.

I recoiled. Nobody could convince me that I ought to feel anything then for the next five minutes. Get the idea? You hadn't ever felt anything that far from the body -- five or six feet... Feeling it, you see, just exactly as though it was the body. You know, feeling it just as though you would feel it -- not with your hand, with a beam, but just experiencing its existence. And it was cold and clammy and covered with wax. Nyah!

Well now, things get more difficult; things are, in final essence, an action called creation, creativeness; and mechanics do not require a thoughtful statement. They are their own class of action or beingness. You know learning processes; you could communicate this fact to a preclear or receive this fact yourself sufficiently well that you could bring these actions or objects into existence.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]